Application No. 10/798,697
Amendment dated April 22, 2008
Response to Office Action of January 22, 2008

Atty. Docket No. 42P18003
Examiner Alicia Baturay
TC/A.U. 2155

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Claims 6-14, 19 and 20 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-5 and 16-19 are pending.

OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

Informalities in the specification have been corrected herein. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

Informalities in claim 1 have been corrected herein. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objections to the claim be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 6, 7 and 9 were rejected as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the term "system" was not inherently viewed as indicating a machine. Claims 6, 7 and 9 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 6, 7, and 9 is moot.

Claims 11-14 were rejected as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the claims were considered directed to software modules. While Applicants disagree with the analysis provided in the Office action, claims 11-14 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 11-14 is moot.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-20 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No.

2006/0242325 of Ramaswamy, et al. (*Ramaswamy*). Claims 6-14, 19 and 20 have been

canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 6-14, 19 and 20 is moot. For at least the

reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-5 and 16-19 are not anticipated

by *Ramaswamy*.

Claim 1 recites:

> execute a discoverable home network transcoder server to
> communicatively couple to a media server to receive media signals from
> the media server, to convert the media signals to a format compatible with
> more than one media renderers, and to transmit the converted signals to
> the more than one media renderers, wherein the media signals are
> converted by the discoverable home network transcoder server before the
> media signals are requested by any of the more than one media renderers.

Thus, Applicants claim transcoding (or converting) data before it is requested by a media

renderer. See, for example, paragraph 0029.

Ramaswamy discloses transcoding. However, *Ramaswamy* does not appear to

explicitly disclose transcoding before the file is requests. Therefore, *Ramaswamy* cannot

anticipate claim 1 or any claim that depends therefrom.

Claim 15 recites:

> incorporating a home network media renderer by a client of a
> home network, the client being a module in a web browser having a
> network application program that supports a first media file format for the
> home network media renderer;
> encoding the home network media renderer in the first media file
> format to support media files of the first media file format;
> converting a media file to a second media file format before
> receiving a request for the media file;
> requesting from a media server with the network application
> program of the client the media file in the second media file format; and

recognizing with a discoverable home network transcoder server that the media file is of the second media file format and converting the home network media renderer of the network application program to the second media file format prior to providing the media file to the web browser module of the client.

Thus, Applicants claim a method in which a media file is converted in a home network system before the media file is requested.

As discussed above, *Ramaswamy* does not appear to explicitly disclose transcoding before the file is requests. Therefore, *Ramaswamy* cannot anticipate claim 15 or any claim that depends therefrom.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-5 and 16-19 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: __April 22, 2008_____   _/Paul A. Mendonsa/_____
                                       Paul A. Mendonsa
                                       Attorney for Applicant
                                       Reg. No. 42,879

                                       12400 Wilshire Boulevard
                                       Seventh Floor
                                       Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
                                       (503) 439-8778